

arouse him to a greater desire to see. They tell him rather, that what he sees is truth, but that due to his mental astigmatism he sees it imperfectly, and that they can interpret it for him to their mutual advantage. Not realizing that the master lives intirely at his expense, and that therefore a mutual benefit is unthinkable, he falls for the lie, and is bound in his chains once more. So it was at the time of this story. The Masters and the Marionetts of labor, saw that this industrial agitation aimed directly at the source of power, and so they stampeded the herd into the cane breaks of political socialism, and from there into the dispersion.

The Master Class is annoyed, but not terified, by the purely political activities of the workers. As long as the workers think they can satisfy their present hunger at next years' election, they may be troublesome, but can safely be called harmless. But if on the other hand, they organize to control the industry from which they make their living, they will take more value for their product with the result, that there will be less profit for the Master. Masters love all reforms that will increase, and despise all action that tends to decrease, what they call their share of the product of labor. This is a perfectly natural attitude with which it is useless to quarel. For this reason they say, "If we must choose one of these two evils afflicting the slaves, we prefer the political instead of the industrial, for, over the political activities we have control thru the courts, but a solidly organized industry, in which the men are systematically instructed as to their needs and powers, is not so easily handled.

Political action by the workers, unless it has for its base a class conscious prolitaire, bent on using the offices of state for the furtherance of working class interests, serves for little more than a safety valve for the emotional pressure of the masses. For as it some times happens the slaves do elect a "black sheep," the masters will refuse to seat him, or if they do seat him, he no sooner shows his color then he will be removed by the courts. The exceptions are those who do not show their color. But if the working class elects a member, not of a craft, but of a well organized industry, and backs that officer with their economic power then he too becomes a factor in the state and slavery will be on the way to oblivion.

This view however was not taken by the industrialists of that day; they held that industrial action was in itself all sufficient. On the other hand, there were many workers, who in spite of the predatory characteristics of the owning class maintained that political action was all that was needed.

Jack had told Collins before he started on his way to the convention, that a programme of political action

the bolts; a fourth would seize the cars, for fire-wood; and a fifth would smash the mirrors in order to shave himself by the reflection of their fragments; and so on: it must be clear to everyone that such a division would not only not be equal, but would lead merely to an insane destruction of useful objects, which might have served many purposes. Similarly, it would be silly to divide up a single machine in this way. Suppose one man should take the driving-wheel, another the piston-rod, and other persons should take the remaining parts, the machine would cease to be a machine; it would become mere scrap-iron. And it would be similar with all complicated devices, which are more important than anything else in the prosecution of our work. Merely consider for a moment the telegraph instruments, the instruments for chemical works, etc. It is clear that only a complete fool or a downright enemy of the working-class could recommend such a division.

But such a division would not be harmful only for the above reason. Let us assume that by some miracle, someone had succeeded in dividing up, more or less equally, everything that had been taken away from the wealthy. Even then nothing particularly useful would result. For what does such a division mean? It would mean that we should have substituted a number of small owners for a few big ones. It would not signify the abolition of private property, but the extension of it; we should have petty ownership instead of large ownership. And yet the time of petty ownership is already past. We know very well that capitalism and the big capitalists arose out of the dissensions of the petty owners with one another. If by our division we had succeeded in increasing the class of small owners, the following result would be observed: A part of them (a very large part) would on the very next day dispose of their gains in some junkshop and their property would in this way soon fall into the hands of the more well-to-do owners; among the others there would arise conflicts for the sale of their materials, and in these conflicts, the well-to-do would get the best of the poorer. The poor would become still poorer and would by this process be converted into true proletarians, while the richer would become still richer and would gradually be transformed into true capitalists. Thus we should finally return, after osme time, to that very structure of society which we have just destroyed. We should very soon find ourselves once more confronting the self-same trough of capitalistic exploitation.

The division into private (petty) property is not the ideal of the worker or of the country-serf. It is an ideal of the petty shopkeeper, who is oppressed by the big shopkeeper, but who wishes to become a big shopkeeper himself. How to become "one of the bunch", by getting all he can into his possession, that is the philistine's dream. To think of others, to think of the final results of this scramble, — that would be asking too much of the shopkeeper; all he wants is to feel